

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
July 30, 2001**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Alexandra Elias	American Planning Association
Allison Rolfe	San Diego Audubon
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Kevin Doyle	National Wildlife Federation
Liz Higgins	San Diego Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	Ramona Chamber of Commerce
Dave Shibley	
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Janet Anderson	Sierra Club
Jeanne Pagett	
John Elliott	Descanso Planning Group
Juliana Bugbee	
Lee Vance	
Lynne Baker	
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Michael Menghini	Julian Merchants Association
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Pat Flanagan	
Paul Gebert	SDCWA
Rich Cantillon	Sierra Club
Ruth Potter	
Troy Murphree	Sweetwater Authority

County:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Eli Barbosa (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for July 9, 2001
 - There were no corrections made. G. Piro moved to approve the minutes. A. Stehly seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- b) Minutes for July 16, 2001
 - There were no corrections made. G. Piro moved to approve the minutes. A. Stehly seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- c) Steering Committee Update (added agenda item)
 - K. Scarborough felt it was important to give the committee an update of the July 28, 2001 Steering Committee meeting because the Interest Group Committee's draft land use concepts criteria were modified.
 - A preamble was placed over all of the concepts stating that these are tools to be used by the planning groups in the planning process. The Steering Committee began to see the Concepts Criteria as a tool and began to craft them to their own communities.
 - The Steering Committee modified concept D further by adding a Rural Residential (formerly Semi-Rural) section to concept D.
 - G. Piro requested to see the Steering Committee's modifications. As the meeting was held on Saturday, two days prior to this meeting and since it was not placed on the agenda, staff did not bring forth the Steering Committee recommendations.
 - **Motion:** G. Piro officially requested for a joint meeting with the Steering Committee. This motion was put on hold.
 - D. Silver wanted to confirm that the consultants were basing the map structure upon concepts A through D and not the Steering Committee's modifications of the concepts. I. Holler replied that the consultants will consider the Steering Committee's recommendations but will try to come back with the concepts A through D to the greatest extent.
 - J. Elliott (Descanso CPG) stated that the reason the Rural Residential (formerly Semi-Rural) section was added to concept D was because property of 2, 4, and 8 acres need to be recognized as being out there and existing. The committee felt that concept D was too growth inducing east of the CWA line.
- d) Field Trip
 - D. Coombs had proposed a field trip that could be accomplished in a single day – Spring Valley, Lakeside, Alpine, Ramona, and Fallbrook with general areas to focus on. She thought it would be an advantage to meet in Mission Valley, carpool and stop at sites for dialogue as everyone has a special perspective to each area. She also thought about inviting planning group chairpersons from each area to attend. Those who cannot attend on the Saturday can take their own tour.
 - D. Van Dierendonck felt that 15 or 20 cars on the road would be dangerous on the back roads and suggested taking a bus. I. Holler replied that a bus will be a problem because there may be a quorum.
 - G. Piro requested meeting at the Gaslamp Quarters in Downtown to look at areas of densification and to incorporate Hoffman's transit plan if the committee gets a map of where they are going.
 - J. Whalen thought it would be good to see more suburban densification because there is a need to come up with good examples of this.
 - T. Barker suggested looking at Otay Ranch for these examples.
 - D. Coombs stated that the committee seems to be looking at two field trips. One looking at density for examples to educate communities that it can improve an area and not necessarily hurt them. J. Whalen will be assisting D. Coombs with this field trip.
 - E. Bruvold suggested breaking up the field trip to get a good two to three hours in rather than an all-day Saturday commitment. M. Johnson suggested a weekday.

- The field trip will be held on Monday, August 13 in lieu of a formal Interest Group Committee meeting between 9 am to 3 pm. Meeting location is the Kmart parking lot in Ramona. This field trip will include Ramona and Lakeside only.
- D. Shibley suggested bringing a camera.

Agenda Item III: Glossary of Tools (Presentation by Marette Esperance) –

- a) Definition of Regional Categories
 - There are eight regional categories in the existing General Plan which are applied throughout the unincorporated area. There was originally six and the last two were created in the last 20 years.
 - These are changed in two basic ways – public (community plan updates) and privately initiated.
 - CRDA was added after 1979 as part of the Alpine Community Plan update because Alpine perceived the need to make the Country Town smaller and have a more dense category around the Country Town.
 - K. Scarborough asked whether the regional categories were created by the department or by vote. M. Esperance replied that it is strictly a Board action.
- b) Definition of Land Use Designations
 - There are six groups of land use designations and 26 land use designations overall which are applied within Regional Categories and through the Community Plans.
 - E. Bruvold asked what extent do the categories constrain or shape how the land use designations are applied. M. Esperance replied that there is no hierarchy within the categories and that there are other policies within land use development that tells us when a category applies.
 - There has to be a compatibility between the regional categories and land use designations.
 - S. Molloy asked for a clarification of land use designations and lot size. M. Esperance stated that land use designations identify the type of development that is going to occur there.
 - D. Shibley asked how the LAFCO spheres dovetail in with the regional categories. M. Esperance replied that she was not familiar with it. This is something that is used in terms of current planning but since she does not do General Plan/Community Plan updates, she does not know how they are used.
 - R. Potter commented on how recreation areas are put out there in the RDA and ECA and how important it is to recognize Cleveland and Anza-Borrego are out there and that everything that is adjacent should be compatible.
 - The EDA is almost as big as an entire urbanized area.

Agenda Item IV: Growth Management Tools –

- c) Introduction on Other Tools (Presentation by Rosemary Rowan)
 - Tools that limit housing and population levels, they simply say that we are going to have so many new houses in the next 20 years or we are going to hold our population to a certain level for the next 20 years and not necessarily where and when that happens in the next 20 years.
 - Problem with some of these is that it does not necessarily respond to market conditions.
 - J. Whalen stated that we should be looking for a permanent land use decision at this juncture because the supply of land is finite.
 - R. Rowan stated that we need to link the goals to tools. All of this is fairly complicated and staff does plan to do a much more thorough presentation.
 - K. Messer asked if we wanted to discuss other tools not on the handout. A. Stehly stated that there are some on the handout that they may not want to discuss further.

- D. Silver was interested in knowing what the consultants were doing regarding TDRs because of the need for guidance and for real work to be done. I. Holler replied that a letter was sent laying out the possible steps for a TDR implementation program.
- E. Bruvold suggested adding a fourth column and a fifth column (states whether or not it is permissible to California law) and would like to focus in on the tools that are in place.
- K. Scarborough said that she would rather have the committee think of the tools that you would want to elevate rather than eliminate.
- A. Elias asked what the timeframe was on the drafts of the regional elements. I. Holler responded that the concepts will be used for the land use distribution map to be used before the elements which will be sometime early next year.
- A. Elias asked at what point the tools were to come in. I. Holler responded that the tools are not on a critical path for the map but there is discussion that implementation be concurrent with other tasks.
- D. Coombs stated that the existing General Plan was put together at a time that has passed us by and has placed us in the problems today. She is not advocating throwing out the existing plan but recognizes that we need to identify mechanisms and tools that will help us with the new General Plan.
- E. Bowlby asked with regards to the framework, if we were going to obtain the urban limit line that the existing General Plan has. K. Scarborough replied that we have the concepts and we will be looking at retaining it.

Agenda Item V: Process –

a) Status & Next Steps

- I. Holler announced that we will hopefully present the structure maps to the Steering Committee on August 25th and to this group on the 27th.
- K. Messer asked about the gap analysis which I. Holler responded that it was too early in the process.
- Next steps include a field trip, maps and discussion on the framework.

Agenda Item VI: Public Comments –

- D. Van Dierendonck asked how we are to deal with SPAs that will push the population target over and how do you protect natural resource areas.
- D. Shibley mentioned that you need to contact Rick Pruetz to buy his book.
- J. Anderson stated that our categories need to be defined because we have undefined open space.
- C. Anderson stated that the densities that the group is planning to apply will devastate community character if it hits Ramona. She wants to keep their community character and rural atmosphere.
- B. McDonald is encouraging the committee to simplify things and to think about the general public when creating this plan because of the confusion during the presentation on regional categories. He feels that more different categories and sub-categories will promote sprawl.